



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.										
09/641,184	08/17/2000	Brian John Cragun	ROC920000064	5343										
7590 Gero G McClellan Thomason Moser & Patterson LLP Suite 1500 3040 Post Oak Boulevard Houston, TX 77056-6582		<table border="1"><tr><td>EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td>LAZARO, DAVID R</td></tr><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>2155</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>02/28/2008</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>			EXAMINER	LAZARO, DAVID R	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2155		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	02/28/2008	PAPER
EXAMINER														
LAZARO, DAVID R														
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER													
2155														
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE													
02/28/2008	PAPER													

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte BRIAN JOHN CRAGUN

Appeal 2007-1956
Application 09/641,184
Technology Center 2100

Decided: February 28, 2008

Before LANCE LEONARD BARRY, MAHSHID D. SAADAT, and
ALLEN R. MACDONALD, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MACDONALD, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL
STATEMENT OF CASE

Introduction

Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from a final rejection of claims 21-28 and 33-37. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

According to Appellant, the invention is a method, article of manufacture, system, and data structure for providing a chained or

compound uniform resource locator (URL) including a base URL and all subsequent navigation steps necessary to access a desired resource (Spec. 3:19-21).

Representative Claim(s)

Representative independent claim 21 under appeal reads as follows:

21. A computer-implemented method for use in a browser program, the method comprising:

storing, for each user manipulation of a currently retrieved resource, data indicative of such user manipulation; and

combining a network address of a base resource and at least one data structure indicative of user manipulation of said base resource to form a compound network address, said compound network address suitable for retrieving a resource according to the stored user manipulations, wherein at least one user manipulation is stored using at least one coordinate of a pointer selection made by a user, wherein the pointer selection comprises a target network address of a resource retrieved by the user.

Prior Art

The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on appeal is:

Anupam	US 6,535,912 B1	Mar. 18, 2003
Matson	US 5,774,123	Jun. 30, 1998

Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 21-28 and 33-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Anupam and Matson.

Appellant's Contentions

(A) Appellant contends that the claimed subject matter of independent claim 21 would not have been obvious. More specifically, Appellant contends that Anupam fails to describe the claimed “network address” (Br. 10-12). Dependent claims 22-24 are not separately argued and stand or fall with claim 21.

(B) Appellant contends that the claimed subject matter of independent claim 25 would not have been obvious. More specifically, Appellant contends that Anupam fails to describe the claimed “URL” (Br. 12). Dependent claims 26-28 are not separately argued and stand or fall with claim 25.

(C) Appellant contends that the claimed subject matter of independent claim 33 would not have been obvious. More specifically, Appellant contends that Anupam fails to describe the claimed “URL chain record header” (Br. 12-13). Dependent claims 34-37 are not separately argued and stand or fall with claim 33.

(D) Further, Appellant contends that the Examiner’s Advisory Action supports Appellant’s contentions (A), (B), and (C).

Result

We affirm.

ISSUE(S)

- (1) Has Appellant established that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 21 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Anupam and Matson.
- (2) Has Appellant established that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 25 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Anupam and Matson.
- (3) Has Appellant established that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 33 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Anupam and Matson.

PRINCIPLES OF LAW

Appellant has the burden on appeal to the Board to demonstrate error in the Examiner's position. See *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 985-86 (Fed. Cir. 2006) ("On appeal to the Board, an applicant can overcome a rejection [under § 103] by showing insufficient evidence of *prima facie* obviousness or by rebutting the *prima facie* case with evidence of secondary indicia of nonobviousness.") (quoting *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1355 (Fed. Cir. 1998)).

ANALYSIS

Appellant does not dispute that the Examiner has correctly shown that the Anupam and Matson references may be combined. Nor does Appellant dispute that the Examiner has correctly shown the teachings of the Matson reference.

Rather, as noted *supra*, Appellants contend that the Anupam reference fails to describe a network address, a URL, and a URL chain record header. With respect to each contention, the Examiner fully addresses Appellant's arguments at pages 10-16 of the Answer.

We disagree with Appellant's contentions and we adopt the Examiner's responses as our own.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

(1) Appellant has failed to establish that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 21-24 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Anupam and Matson.

(2) Appellant has failed to establish that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 25-28 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Anupam and Matson.

(3) Appellant has failed to establish that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 33-37 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Anupam and Matson.

(4) Claims 21-28 and 33-37 are not patentable.

Appeal 2007-1956
Application 09/641,184

DECISION

The Examiner's rejection of claims 21-28 and 33-37 is affirmed.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED

pgc

Gero G McClellan
Thomason Moser & Patterson LLP
Suite 1500
3040 Post Oak Boulevard
Houston TX 77056-6582